REMARKS

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the present invention with respect to the prior art. Claims 4, 11, and 18 have been cancelled, and their defining elements respectively included in independent claims 1, 8, and 15. All of the remaining claims depend from claims 1, 8, and 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of remaining claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-21 as being obvious over Carni (US6,636,873) in view of Beizer (US6,240,414) under 35 USC 103(a).

Applicants' Attorney has a telephone interview scheduled with Examiner on October 25, 2004 in which it is hoped that the clear distinction over the cited prior art will be clarified.

The two references and the present invention are directed to the same general data processing technology i.e. the group editing of documents when replication conflicts arise. These occur when two or more users edit the same document but provide differences in data content of a pair or more of the same document to result in replication conflicts between two or more replicas of the same document. Current systems have processes for handling replication conflicts. Both the Carni and Beizer references disclose variations in techniques for resolving replication conflicts. Like Carni and Beizer, these generally involve various combinations of document weighting and prioritization schemes.

However, the present invention is directed to a problem beyond such prioritization. As set forth in the present specification (last paragraph on page 3 through first paragraph on page 4), the invention notes that even after a prioritization process to determine which is the main document and which the secondary document of the conflicting replicated pair or larger, the secondary document still could have value. In such a case, the other documents of

8

the pair or group are still saved with some indication that is displayed to indicate the other documents as secondary documents.

The present invention relates to a system where the main and secondary replicated documents are first determined and stored. The invention then provides a process for subsequently periodically going into the database and looking through the main and secondary documents to determine which documents should remain and which documents should be eliminated from storage in the database. Both Carni and Beizer have processes for prioritizing of replication in documents. However, there is nothing in either reference to suggest the present process of subsequently going through the databases of saved main and secondary replicated documents to eliminate some of such documents to reduce storage load.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-21 as amended are now submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Kraft   10/21/04
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
            David A. Mims
            IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
            IBM Corporation
            11400 Burnet Road
            Austin, Texas 78758

9